



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,593	09/29/2003	David Albrecht	HSJ920030097US1	2407

51298 7590 04/13/2005

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 NORTHLAND DRIVE
SUITE 390
ST. PAUL, MN 55120

EXAMINER

HEINZ, ALLEN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2653

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,593

Applicant(s)

ALBRECHT ET AL.

Examiner

A. J. HEINZ

Art Unit

2653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-31, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 4, 5 and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/29/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 2653

1. The following is a quotation of 37 CFR 1.71(a)-(c):

(a) The specification must include a written description of the invention or discovery and of the manner and process of making and using the same, and is required to be in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art or science to which the invention or discovery appertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same.

(b) The specification must set forth the precise invention for which a patent is solicited, in such manner as to distinguish it from other inventions and from what is old. It must describe completely a specific embodiment of the process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or improvement invented, and must explain the mode of operation or principle whenever applicable. The best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention must be set forth.

(c) In the case of an improvement, the specification must particularly point out the part or parts of the process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter to which the improvement relates, and the description should be confined to the specific improvement and to such parts as necessarily cooperate with it or as may be necessary to a complete understanding or description of it.

The specification is objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 because the subject matter of Cls.18 is not fully disclosed.

Art Unit: 2653

What does applicant intend to cover in the scope of protection by the feature "operational parameter"?

2. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as directed to subject matter which was not described in the specification in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention. See previous paragraph.

3. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following phrases lack clear antecedent basis within the claim(claims); i.e. either the particularly recited passage fails to be properly introduced prior to its appearance at that point in the claim or the structure recited in the passage is not an inherent part of or component of other previously recited structure: "HDD components" (Cl.23, line 2).

An exhaustive search of indefinite and/or ambiguous language has not been attempted, but only exemplified in the

Art Unit: 2653

preceding paragraphs. Therefore the applicant is responsible for a thorough review of all the claims to make corrections as appropriate.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1&2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Treseder.

Treseder discloses all of the claimed features wherein the hard disk drive is considered to be the components shown in figure 1[e.g. the disks, actuator, etc.] because the claimed

Art Unit: 2653

hard disk drive does not indicate whether it is in an enclosure or not.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6-31,33,34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Treseder as applied to claims 1&2 above and further in view of the well known use of the claimed materials and processes.

Therefore official notice is invoked as indicating that the claimed modifications are well accepted in the art and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2653

Rationale: the claimed modifications are simply alternative means of achieving the same results for the same purposes as the structure and processes shown in and known in the prior art.

8. Claims 1,3,6-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rent or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Treseder.

Rent discloses all of the claimed features with the exception of clearly identifying the feedthrough and flange which is shown by Treseder in figure 3 as element 60.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to fabricate the housing of Rent with a feedthrough and flange in view of Treseder.

Re:

Claim 3, the upper disc drive as shown in figure 4 operates to act as an inside cover;

Claims 6-26, the limitations directed to the types of materials are well known in the art and therefore by official notice are held to be obvious modifications.

Moreover, those features that further modify the material and/or structural limitations such as "solidifies after", "cold forging", "is soldered", etc. are process or quasi-process

Art Unit: 2653

features which are not given any patentable weight because their presence in an apparatus claim.

Rationale: the claimed modifications are simply alternative means of achieving the same results for the same purposes as the structure and processes shown in and known in the prior art.

9. For a complete response applicant should identify how the claimed structure of his invention defines over **all** the art of record.

Moreover, where the applicant disagrees with the reasoning and/or application of the prior art on critical points of the claims, they should identify how the claimed structure of their invention defines over **all** the art of record not just the applied art.

Where applicant believes that the art is redundant and/or superfluous relative to the critical aspects of the claimed invention the applicant may simply state so in rebuttal summary.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Nakanishi, Lemke and Kikinis show various structural configuration for disk drive enclosures.

Art Unit: 2653

11. Claims 4,5&32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. If applicant has filed an information disclosure statement and this instant office action does not contain an initialed-off copy (or copies) of all such filed IDS's (or at least a comment to the disposition of such IDS'S in the body of the office action itself) applicant should apprise the examiner of such missing documentation [to the IDS's] in response to this office action so that the examiner can take appropriate action to supply same to the applicant.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. J. HEINZ whose telephone number is (703) 308-1544. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WILLIAM KORZUCH can be reached on (703) 305-6137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A. J. HEINZ
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2653

